

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

VOL. X.—NO. 36.

Published Weekly.

BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK.

TERMS,

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

All communications for the paper, and letters
to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed
S. H. GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS
WILSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New
York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

THE STANDARD.

Anti-Slavery Mass Convention,
THE ABOLITIONISTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
AT CITY HALL, SYRACUSE.

[Continued.]

TUESDAY JAN. 15—EVENING SESSION

THE PRESIDENT called to order at 6 1/2 o'clock.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Waldo.

The PRESIDENT read the balance of the Report of the Business Committee; and also the resolution offered by Mr. Pillsbury, and asked for the order of the question.

Mr. BURLEIGH moved that the Convention take up

6th and 7th resolutions.

Mr. B. said he would also read the following resolution, handed to the Business Committee, and moved adoption:

Resolved, that we cannot look towards the Captain of our country, without seeing there two men incarcerated in jail belonging to the republic, by order of the U. S. Court, for having done what every man of liberty and humanity ought to do whenever opportunity offers, to wit, helped a number of fel-

men in their endeavor to attempt to escape from slavery; and that we ought to feel the chain which binds them around our own limbs, and struggle with them until they are set at liberty.

Mr. BURLEIGH said he had something to offer, for reason that no one else proposed to do so.

The Constitution had embarrassed the action of government. Unless its demands were complied with, it would dissolve the diplomatic relations of our government with that of Austria when he does not even propose to dissolve the relations between South Carolina and Massachusetts—when Austria is possibly capable of.

How long is it since any man in Congress dared to say his "soul was his own" on this question? Were they not brow-beaten and insulted? Daniel Garrison has expressed free sentiments north of Mason's & Dixon's line; but not south of it. Is he a free man south of Mason's and Dixon's line?

To show up the contemptible spirit of Northern cringing to Southern dictation, Mr. R. read a petition of two or three Irishmen, to be appointed Commissioners of exercise about 200 years ago, which convulsed the house with laughter. He referred to the imprisonment of Rev. Mr. FAIRBANKS, four years and a half in the penitentiary of Kentucky, for aiding in the escape of slaves, and asked if that could be done, if northern men were manly and free?

He referred to the U. S. squadron, on the coast of Africa, for the suppression of the Slave-Trade—while in command, is Com. Jones, a man who at home and abroad, is a practical slaveholder, and on the coast of Africa was usurped upon by the kidnappers.

It could not have been passed but for the oil

of compromise. I call it compromise, in ob-

serve to the common use of the term; it usually

means the giving up of something on both sides.

Mr. B. read the advertisement for the sale of an intelligent and accomplished girl, at Norfolk, whose only crime was an attempt to gain her liberty. Yet we hold meetings to sympathize with Hungarians; when towards these, we are as insensible as the

stones in yonder graveyard.

Rev. Mr. FAIRBANKS was called for. He should refer to political questions. He should speak

of what he knew, that all might sympathize with those now in bondage for aiding in the escape of slaves.

Amasa Walker, a Professor in Oberlin, af-

ter he was arrested, denied in anger, that he knew him. He deserted him. Mr. F. was sent without process, and was four years and a half in the Penitentiary. He went on to speak of the narrow escape of Simpson, of Mass., when he came to visit him. He went on to speak of the selfishness of the South, and the system of braggadocio by which the reputation of men there is magnified.

Mr. F. went on, and gave quite a detailed account of his case—that he did not retrace one iota of his principles—and related the embarrassments and cruelties of his imprisonment—and said he must have died for that the timely relief furnished by James Canning Fuller, who was the first to furnish him aid. He exhorted the Convention not to forget those in the South who are Slavery, and who have not one sixteenth of negro blood in their veins.

Tom Clay—son of Henry Clay—has a slave who has more negro blood in his veins, than Mr. Bur-

leigh (pointing to C. C. Burleigh). His hair and complexion were both almost precisely the same as those of Mr. B. (what is commonly called sandy.)

Mr. F. concluded with an appeal in favor of peti-

tions to Congress, in favor of abolishing the inter-

state slave trade.

Mr. FOSTER spoke to dissent from a position taken by the last speaker; and that, too, notwithstanding it was so well understood that whatever was said by any man in these Conventions, was for himself alone. There was one sentiment by Mr. Fairbanks, from which he must differ—and so does the society to which he belongs. The idea was this: that it was right to use the necessary means to aid slaves to escape—to use deception.

Mr. FAIRBANKS: The gentleman is mistaken; I took no such ground.

GERRET SMITH: The language was, "it would

necessary to suppress a part of the truth"—lan-

guage which, in such a case, I love to endorse.

Mr. FOSTER continued: He received the impres-

sion differently from the course of the gentleman's argument. He went on to say, that the rule of the society to which he belonged, was that they were at all times to speak all they thought, and to mean what they say. He instanced a member of their society, who was arrested in Delaware; and who answered the Court, that if he did not assist in the escape of the slaves in question, he had assisted in the escape of at least four hundred others. This was the idea of the course to pursue. If you go to the South, go with no concealed purposes—have no more glory, as when reduced to one, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ on the cross, when his disciples had fled.

What is the objection to the Liberty Party? What

is it? Is that that Party votes for civil rulers?

May it not vote for Civil Rulers? No; not under the Constitution. But I hold that we might vote for civil rulers, even if there were no Federal Constitution.

The right to vote for Civil Rulers, overrides all human constitutions, and all human arrange-

ments; it is a God-derived right.

I go to the polls with my neighbor, and we elect a good and humane man. He is asked to sign a pa-

per, made sometime ago, denying the existence of a God. He cannot do it; but is he not bound to enter upon his office? We are bound to do all we can to maintain a righteous civil government. What ever respect we may owe to our dead fathers, we should pay more respect to our living selves, and to the living God.

Mr. THOMAS said it would be recollect that the

Constitution is pro-slavery or anti-slavery, were

the Constitution of the United States, and all human

property of the South should be a basis, in the

case of direct taxation, to pay for its representation

Congress. But what has that amounted to? Not

much has been raised by direct taxation, as was

attributed from the surplus revenue. So that the

South paid for Florida, Louisiana, the Mexican war,

and for all the other disbursements which Slavery

as required.

The question now, the slaveholders tell us, is,

Slavery shall go into the new territory, or the Union

shall be dissolved. Is not the reason why Slavery

should not be extended in the fact that it is wrong?

Mr. REMOND would add his testimony to that of

Mr. Burleigh. All who have read the history of

Slavery for 50 years, can attest the truth of his

statements. It was well done, and conclusive. But

there was the same cost of Northern individuality

as of Southern money.

He did not propose to introduce the scarred backs

of slave fathers; the branded arms of slave mothers;

but he proposed to speak of Northern character and

Citizenship. If the Northern free white men lose

one-tenth of their rights of freedom, it is equal to

the loss of ninety-nine hundredths of the rights of

white men before me. When a boy, I went to Fourth

Mr. BURLEIGH said he was one side; he might

differ from all others; and was consequently he

have as much time as all the others.

Mr. THOMAS said he did not know in how many

ways they were to be much as time to repel as

occupied in the attack.

Mr. BURLEIGH wanted to know how it would be

if there were difference of views—whether all kinds

of shades of opinion would have an equal amount of

time?

Mr. THOMAS said he did not know in how many

ways they should be as much time to repel as

occupied in the attack.

Mr. BURLEIGH said he was one side; he might

differ from all others; and was consequently he

have as much time as all the others.

GERRET SMITH said the question presented itself

in the simplest form. Upon one side were those

the schoolboys' delight repeating the senti-

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY,
JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editors.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1850.

WHOLE NUMBER 504.

ment that "resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." Is not that Anti-Slavery? Mr. Burleigh might have gone on and added, that we have yet to see a single instance of a Representative of our Government, who at home and abroad has advocated equality in legislation. So the South controls the mind of the North. Willis lately objected to the appointment of Webb to Austria—but of Webb's participation in mobbing Abolitionists, a few years ago, no mention is made unfiting him to represent our Government abroad.

Mr. R. referred to the Right of Petition, and to the cases of Hoar and Hubbard, at Charleston and New Orleans. He called attention to these facts, to show that Northern liberty is compromised, if not wholly blasted, by Southern dictation. Mr. Hubbard commenced his account of his mission to New Orleans by saying, "Mr. President, since my escape from the South, I will give you an account of my expedition." Had he escaped from horse theft, from burning a house?—from any sort of crime? No—only from a mission to see the rights of Northern freemen in New Orleans. He referred to the ignominious and ruffianly treatment of Mr. Hoar, at Charleston.

The PRESIDENT said that was the idea he had in view in proposing a division of the resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER said the subjects could be divided, by understanding or consent; without the division of the resolutions.

Mr. SMITH insisted on having the resolutions all considered together. That was the agreement, and he insisted upon it. He was here to defend the Liberty Party; and he wanted no division of the question.

The PRESIDENT said he should not stop the speakers at a half hour—but, on the whole, give each side an equal amount of time. "Agreed," "agreed," from both sides.

A pleasant conversation occurred between the President and Mr. Burleigh as to the rhetoric of some of the gentlemen in reference to the discussion.

The PRESIDENT announced that the resolutions were in order.

Mr. BURLEIGH opened the discussion. He said it was their duty to do so, as having the affirmative.

He would give some of the reasons why he, and those who thought with him, condemn the Constitution, and take their position outside the government.

We say that the government is wrong. We say that the slaves are wrongfully held. We say that the master has no right to detail or rebuke him; and that no one else has a right to do that which the master has no right to do.

We believe the Constitution does require that we aid in the reclaiming of the fugitive slave, if we acknowledge the rightfulness of the government.

Our friend (Mr. Smith) and others, would say with me, that if the Constitution required this, it would be our duty to trample it under foot.

If we support the Constitution, we must support it as a whole—we cannot support a part and reject a part.

If we take the terms of the Constitution, "law,"

"held to service," and "labor," in the understood and popular sense, we must take the ground that we are by the Constitution bound to give up fugitive slaves.

We are to act on what is believed by the parties that they agree to. He illustrated it in this way. A man goes to the city of New York, and goes through the streets, crying "Mud for sale." A man goes up and looks at the contents of the tub, and finds it contains good honey; and the crier agreed to deliver it for so many cents per pound. He delivers "the mud" but cannot profit by the cheat. He gave the man honey, and when he cried "mud for sale," and he was bound to deliver good honey; for that was the article which his acts and the other man's eyes led the purchaser to suppose he had purchased.

At the time of the Dorr rebellion, the fact that the government of Rhode Island called upon the general government, brought the U. S. forces to their support.

The fact that the South have representatives of slave property, make them legislators for us. I cannot have them legislate for me.

Our doctrine is, "No union with slaveholders."

Any one who adopts the conclusions we do, in reference to fugitive slaves, insurgent slaves, and in reference to Slavery generally, must adopt our conclusion—"No union with slaveholders."

If you think the Constitution is Anti-Slavery, you have already dissolved with slaveholders. You have no union with them. They know of no such government; and my friends Smith, Thomas, and others, are out of a union with slaveholders, as much as I am.

We believe that that cannot be law which tramples upon right. With that definition, it is plain that the Constitution is not Anti-Slavery; in other words, that it is an illegal Constitution. A law is a contract between parties, and must be maintained according to its terms. Mr. B. went on and examined the origin and nature of law.

Mr. B. referred to the unanimous vote in the Convention which framed the Constitution, to substitute "service" for "servitude" as conclusive that the few that were for favoring Slavery were satisfied they secured the thing desired by them.

James MADISON was referred to. He said the Constitution is better for the slaveholders than the Confederation; for the Constitution allows the slaveholders to chase their runaway slaves to the Free States, which the Confederation did not.

It was moved at the time of the formation of the Constitution, that they were to have the right to reclaim fugitive slaves, to put down slave insurrections, and they were to submit to legislation by the representatives of slave property.

Mr. B. took the ground that the preamble of a Constitution qualifies and explains the intent or understanding of its specific provisions, but does not control them. If the Preamble of our Constitution is ordained to establish "justice," it shows that in the opinion of the framers of the Constitution it was a matter of "justice" to reclaim fugitive slaves.

Mr. B. went on to argue the pro-slavery character of the Constitution, from the provisions in reference to the Constitution, and the intent of their framers at the time they framed it.

Mr. B. protested that he had always made a distinction between the legal character of the Constitution, and the intent of their framers at the time they framed it.

Mr. BUR

